

# Assigning What's New events to Cochrane Reviews

- [Withdrawing published Cochrane Reviews](#)

'What's new' events in [Review Manager](#) (RevMan) become the Version History of a protocol or a review when it is published on the Cochrane Library.

Use 'What's new' events in [Review Manager](#) (RevMan) to describe the changes to the protocol or review since it was last published. What's New events are used to help readers understand the type of change made to a new version of a Cochrane Review (or protocol for a Cochrane Review), such as an amendment, an update, and whether the conclusions have been changed or not. This is to ensure that the history of changes to a review remain with the review as new versions are published.

The information you enter as a description in RevMan is visible to readers. Please explain changes clearly and concisely.

It is essential to select the appropriate What's New events as set out in the table below. The reasons for this are:

- To ensure a new citation is applied when appropriate.
  - *Note that assigning a new citation generates a new digital object identifier (DOI) and citation in external databases, including [PubMed](#). Changes to the following details can be updated manually in PubMed by Wiley, following an amendment with no new citation: Author order; Author names; Joint authorship; Title; Abstract. Cochrane Support can notify Wiley of relevant changes once the amended review is published. For further information contact [support@cochrane.org](mailto:support@cochrane.org).*
- To give readers clear information on what has changed between versions.
- To select the appropriate what's new events before publication because these cannot be changed after publication (e.g. it is not possible to 'undo' a new citation).

 **RevMan guidance:** You can include a maximum of two new 'What's New' events in RevMan. Only information about the changes since the last published version should be in the 'What's New' table.

'What's New' events from previously published versions *must* be moved to the 'History' table in RevMan.

The 'Date' field in RevMan *must* be populated with the date of publication (or as close to it as possible).

Also see: [Digital object identifier \(DOI\) and website address \(URL\) of a Cochrane Review](#) and [Citation versions: DOIs and URLs](#).

## 'What's New' events for Cochrane Reviews and protocols

Use case	Article type	Type of change	Conclusions changed?	New citation version?	'What's new' events to select in RevMan	Wording displayed for event on the Cochrane Library	'What's new' description to add in RevMan
A	Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results of a new search:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Addition of new studies to Included studies, Excluded studies or Ongoing studies</li> <li>◦ If no new studies were identified</li> <li>◦ <i>If studies are added to Awaiting classification only, use an Amended event - see below</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Change in status of a study:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Full inclusion of a study previously awaiting classification</li> <li>◦ Removal of one or more studies previously included (e.g. when studies have been retracted)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	(1) Updated AND (2) New citation: conclusion s changed	(1) New search has been performed  (2) New citation required and conclusions have changed	If a new search was conducted, the search date can be added to the description of the 'Updated' 'What's New' event  See also <a href="#">Report ing search dates</a> .
			No	Yes	(1) Updated AND (2) New citation: conclusion s not changed	(1) New search has been performed  (2) New citation required but conclusions have not changed	
B	Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any changes to the following sections or elements (except for minor text or formatting errors that do not impact the data or review findings or interpretation):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Abstract</li> <li>◦ Plain Language Summary</li> <li>◦ Summary of Findings Tables</li> <li>◦ Scope of the review (e.g. new outcomes, comparisons, types of participants or developments in the intervention or its delivery)</li> <li>◦ Methods</li> <li>◦ Results (e.g. in effect estimates or confidence intervals)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	(1) Amended AND (2) New citation: conclusion s changed	(1) Amended  (2) New citation required and conclusions have changed	Concisely describe what has changed and any resulting change to conclusions, including direction and magnitude of effect and

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Certainty in the results (as expressed by GRADE ratings)</li> <li>◦ Conclusions</li> <li>◦ Licence for Publication type (e.g. Green to Gold Open Access)</li> </ul>	No	Yes	(1) Amended  AND  (2) New citation: conclusions not changed	(1) Amended  (2) New citation required but conclusions have not changed	certainty of evidence (1-2 sentences maximum).  For example: Amendment to Analysis 1.2 due to prior data entry error. GRADE
C	Protocol	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An important change to the objectives or scope of the proposed review (e.g. new outcomes or changes to the priority or definition of the outcomes, comparisons, methodology, types of participants or developments in the intervention or its delivery)</li> </ul>	Not applicable	Yes	(1) New citation: major change	(1) New citation required and major changes	rating for [comparison, outcome] amended from moderate certainty evidence to low certainty evidence.
D	Review or protocol	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minor typographical errors that do not impact the data, findings or interpretation</li> <li>• Changes to information presented in the background section that will not otherwise affect the eligibility criteria (e.g. amending definition or burden of disease, or updating supporting references)</li> <li>• One or more studies removed from 'Studies awaiting classification'</li> <li>• New search performed, but studies not fully incorporated into the results of the review (<i>i.e. added to 'Studies awaiting classification'</i>)</li> <li>• Republishing a withdrawn review to add new information to the withdrawal notice (e.g. to indicate that the review has been superseded by a different review)</li> <li>• Addition of an Editorial note (see <a href="#">Editorial notes</a>)</li> <li>• Changes to author details (see <a href="#">Authorship policy</a> and note above on citations in PubMed). <b>Please note that we do not currently do amendments to correct author affiliations or emails. Authors are asked to confirm their contact information is correct when they review their proofs. If you have any queries about this, please contact <a href="mailto:support@cochrane.org">support@cochrane.org</a>.</b></li> </ul>	No	No	(1) Amended	(1) Amended	

## Withdrawing published Cochrane Reviews

The withdrawal of a published Cochrane Review or a protocol for a Cochrane Review automatically creates a new citation version. To withdraw, see the [policy](#), [guidance](#), and [process](#).